



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/510,438 02/21/2000		Takashi Kohashi	450108-02349	1926
	590 08/17/2004		EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.			GURSHMAN, GRIGORY	
NEW YORK, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
			DATE MAILED: 08/17/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



,	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/510,438	KOHASHI ET AL.				
,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Grigory Gurshman	2132				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE e on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 cion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in a	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	Brief must be filed within the p	eriod set forth in of the appeal.				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be		•				
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b		<i>,</i>				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: see	reconsideration has been cons reasons below.	idered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment (explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b) uld be rejected is provided belo	⊠ will be entered and an wor appended.				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:	4	, ,				
6 Abert 3						
Best Available	COPY SUPERVISO	BERTO BARRON DRY PATENT EXAMINER				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Advisory Action

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100
Part of Paper No. 20040809

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Applicant's amendment of claims 1, 5, 9, 12 and 16 merely reflects a "video signal". This limitation was previously addressed in Vynne, who teaches a method and apparatus for watermarking digital video material by embedding a digital signature (see abstract). Vynne teaches a system and method for embedding a retrievable watermark into a video signal, wherein the video signal provides a series of video frames including a first frame and a subsequent second frame.

Applicant argues that neither Vynne nor Cohen disclose controlling the size of an embedding part of a video signal in accordance with the significance degree of the additional information.

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive for the fallowing reasons:

The control signal of Vynne affects the size of the watermark. Vynne shows the use of watermarks of a different size on the different frames (see Fig.), but does not explicitly teach controlling the size of the embedding part of the watermark. Cohen teaches the use of a variable watermark (WM), which is indicative of a desired length of buffer 40. The WM is preferably changed responsive to one or more parameters relating to a status of the buffer and/or the data flow in network 26 (see column 6, lines 6-20 and Fig. 4, blocks 108 and 104). Therefore, examiner maintains that the combination of references depicts the claimed invention, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to generate an electronic watermark and control the size of the watermark based on the parameters (i.e. additional information) as taught in Cohen for adjusting the buffer size (see Cohen, Fig.4).